

## **The Effect of Writing Feedback Techniques and Students' Writing Anxiety on Students' Essay Writing Ability**

Annisa Astrid, M.Pd.(Corresponding Author), Lecturer, English Education Study Program,  
UIN Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia  
*syahidah0682@yahoo.com*

Dwi Rukmini, M.Pd, Professor, English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Semarang,  
Indonesia  
*wiwidwirukmini@yahoo.com*

Ahmad Sofwan, Ph.D., English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Semarang,  
Indonesia  
*sofwan1589@yahoo.com*

Sri Wuli Fitriati, M.Pd., Ph.D., English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Semarang,  
Indonesia  
*wulifit@yahoo.co.id*

### **Abstract**

The Research was aimed at finding out the effects of the implementation of writing feedback techniques and students' writing anxiety on students' writing ability. Experimental method of 3x2 factorial design was employed in the research. There were three experimental groups of students who were taught by using teacher feedback, peer feedback and the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique. Prior the treatment, each student was asked to do an expository essay writing test in order to get the writing scores and to fill SLWAI (Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory) to classify them into low and high writing anxiety students. Then, the students were taught on how to produce expository essay writing. At the end of the meeting, the students were asked to compose an expository essay as the posttest. The data were analyzed by using paired t-test, two-way ANOVA and Post Hoc test. From the results of data analysis it could be inferred that the implementation of writing feedback techniques affected students' writing ability and the effects depended on the degree of students' writing anxiety.

**Keywords:** Peer feedback, teacher feedback, students' writing anxiety

### **Introduction**

Nation (2009) stated that the writing process consists of seven processes: considering the goals of the writer, having a model of the reader, gathering ideas, organizing ideas, turning ideas into written text, reviewing what has been written and editing. He mentioned that in the first two processes, considering the goals of the writer and model of the reader, the learners/ students need to find out the purpose, the role, the audience, and the type of writing they want to compose. Then, in the third process, gathering ideas, students need to brainstorm and list the ideas to include in the writing. Next, in the process of organizing ideas, the students need to put their own point of view and their own thought into their composition. In the process of turning ideas into texts, students should translate their ideas and their own point of view into the written texts. Finally, in the reviewing session, the students review what they have written to identify mistakes and errors and revise it.

Feedback is the important thing in the reviewing process. Traditionally, teacher is the only one who provides feedback to students' writing in both content and corrective feedback. (Ferris, 2003). The role of peer feedback emerged when there were complex issues where

traditional student/ teacher relationships are unequal in terms of the distribution of power. In the implementation of ‘peer feedback’, the students had the role as the authors and reviewers whose task is to give comments to their peers’ written work (Liu and Hansen, 2002).

There were many pros and cons related to the implementation of peer feedback and teacher feedback in writing classes. Hence, it is not surprising that some researchers have highlighted the complementary roles that teacher and peer feedback can play in the teaching of L2 writing like what Ferris (2003) suggested to have teacher’s intervention during the activities. Therefore, the teacher is expected to intervene the activities properly.

Students have various personality factors that should be considered by the teacher in planning and conducting learning activities. There are some factors that could give positive impact to teaching and learning activities, but there are others that could give bad effects. Psychologically, it is claimed that there is personality factor that might unlikely affect students’ writing performance, while linguistically, there are many language features to consider during the process of writing. Psychologically, one kind of affective factors in language learning comes across with the term “anxiety”: consequently, it is known as factor in academic performance that has long been recognized as a barrier in second language learning context for teachers and students (Brown, 2007).

As far as the writers knew, there was no any research that discussed how students’ writing anxiety influences the implementation of writing feedback techniques (teacher feedback, peer feedback and the combination of peer and teacher feedback). Therefore, the writers were interested in conducting the research that aimed at finding out the effects of writing feedback techniques, and students’ writing anxiety on students’ writing ability.

## **Literature Review**

### **Teacher Written Feedback**

Teacher written feedback has been the common technique used in teaching writing since the process writing approach bloomed as a new means of teaching writing. The role of the feedback is not actually about to correct students’ errors in their writing but indeed as the means to connect to students’ reactions and facilitate improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), writing students seems to value the feedbacks given by their teacher on their writing. Meanwhile, Srichanyachon (2012, p.8) stated that “by using teacher feedback, a teacher could help his/ her students compare their own performance with the ideal one and to diagnose their own strengths and weaknesses”. Finally, in indonesia context, Andianto (2016) reported that teacher written feedback was effective on improving high school students’ writing ability.

However, it is still unclear how those feedbacks contribute to students’ writing development. There were even studies that reported the students just employed the feedbacks from their teacher without knowing the reason why they had to use it to revise their writing.

### **Oral Conference**

Conferencing could be defined as one-on-one consultation between the teacher and the student during the writing process. The purpose of this activity is to allow the teacher and the student to discuss matters that cannot be handled by written responses alone (Ferris, 2003; Hyland, 2003).

Due to the weaknesses of teacher’s written feedback, oral conference which promotes direct interaction between the teacher and the students has been commonly used by the teachers.

In writing conference, the teachers could share their feedbacks to their students face to face to support and encourage them to improve their writing.

Studies on writing conferences (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Patthey- Chavez & Ferris, 1997) have illustrated that this type of face to face communication may be effective for students who have difficulty communicating their opinions in a large group. Writing conferences offer opportunities for students to clarify teachers' written comments on their texts (Zamel, 1985) and at the same time to gain ideas and suggestions to improve their writing ability.

### **Peer Feedback**

Classically, in peer feedback activities, the students work in groups of four or five. Each student gives one copy of her paper to all of the members of the group. Then, each group member reads the other peers' papers and prepares feedbacks to each of them. In the next class, the students in groups would discuss by giving verbal feedbacks on each paper they read. Each student then uses this feedback from the other group members to revise his/her paper (Mittan, 1989; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Paulus, 1999).

Peer feedback actually follows Vygotskian learning theory and interactionist theories of L2 acquisition. Collaborative learning theory encouraged students to 'pool' their resources and both complete tasks they could not do on their own, learning through dialog and interaction with their peers. Vygotskian approaches also underlined the importance of social interaction with peers in theoretical construct of the Zone of Proximal Development suggested that writing skills could emerge with the mediation and help of others. (Liu & Hansen, 2002; Vygotsky, 1978 as cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2006)

There were praise and critics toward the implementation of peer feedback. For example, Hyland (2000) mentioned that peer feedback encouraged student to participate in the classroom activity and make them less passively teacher-dependent. Meanwhile, Yarrow and Topping (2001) claimed that peer feedback played a pivotal role in increased engagement and time spent on-task, immediacy and individualization of help, goal specification, explaining, and prevention of information processing overload, promoting, modeling and reinforcement. Yang et al., (2006) added that peer feedback was beneficial in developing critical thinking, learner autonomy and social interaction among students.

However, there were some researchers showed the inability of the students to provide concrete and useful feedback (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Students, both native speakers of English and learners who studied English as a foreign language tended to give rubber stamp advice when reviewing peers' essays.

### **Combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback**

In order to solve the problems faced in the implementation of peer feedback, Ferris (2003) proposed teacher's intervention in the learning activities. In the implementation of peer feedback activities, there should be clear guidelines provided by teachers in order to have effective and efficient feedback (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998).

Further, Hyland (2003) asserted that because L2 students generally had lack of language capability, peer feedback practices were most effective if they were modeled, taught, and controlled by the teacher. The training was expected to lead to significantly more meaning changes and higher marks on L2 writers' second draft.

In addition to Pre-Training activity, Rollinson (2005) suggested that there should be kind of "intervention training". The broad objective of intervention training is to maximize the

benefits of the peer response activity for each group and each student. The teacher deals with specific problems in the feedback or revising strategies of particular groups or individuals as they arise, and suggests techniques for improving response or revision behaviors.

### Writing Anxiety

Writing anxiety or writing apprehension is defined in a variety of ways. It is used generally to mean the negative and anxious feelings that disrupt part of the writing process. It also relates to the tendency of people to approach or to avoid writing (Cheng, Horwitz, & Schalert, 1999). In order to measure the level of students' writing anxiety, Cheng (2004) developed and evaluated a self-report L2 writing anxiety measure that conforms to a three-dimensional conceptualization of anxiety. The results suggested that both the total scale and the individual subscales of the SLWAI had good reliability and adequate validity.

### Research Questions

In order to find out the effects of writing feedback techniques, and students' writing anxiety on students' writing ability, the following research questions were proposed by the writers:

- Q1. What is the effect of teacher feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?
- Q2. What is the effect of peer feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?
- Q3. What is the effect of the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?
- Q4. Is there any interaction of writing feedback techniques and students' writing anxiety with students' writing ability?
- Q5. How are the comparisons among the effects of the combination of peer and teacher feedback, teacher feedback and peer feedback writing techniques on students' writing ability with different writing anxiety?

## Methodology

### Research Design

The research employed experimental method of data collections. The quantitative data gained from writing test scores addressed whether the treatments had the impact on students' essay writing ability. (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2012). The design was factorial design 3x2. as follows:

**Table 1.** *A Diagram of 3x2 Factorial Design*

Writing Anxiety	Feedback Writing Techniques		
	Peer Feedback (A1)	Teacher Feedback (A2)	Peer & Teacher Feedback (A3)
Low (B1)	A1B1	A2B1	A3B1
High (B2)	A1B2	A2B2	A3B2

Notes:

**A1:**writing scores of group of students who were taught by using teacher feedback technique

**A2:**writing scores of group of students who were taught by using peer feedback technique)

**A3:**writing scores of group of students who were taught by using a combination of peer and teacher feedback

**B1:**writing scores of students having low writing anxiety

**B2:**writing scores of student having high writing anxiety

**A1-B1:**writing scores of the students having low writing anxiety who were taught by using teacher feedback writing technique

**A1-B2:**writing scores of the students having high writing anxiety who were taught by using teacher feedback technique

**A2-B1:**writing scores of the students having low writing anxiety who were taught by using peer feedback writing technique

**A2-B2:**writing scores of the students having high writing anxiety who were taught by using peer feedback technique

**A3-B1:**writing scores of the students having low writing anxiety who are taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback

**A3-B2:**writing scores of the students having high writing anxiety who are taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback

### Participants

The population of the study was fourth semester students of English Education Study Program at Islamic State University of *Raden Fatah* in Palembang, Indonesia. There were four classes of four-semester students with 96 total number of students. The data of students in each class can be seen in the following Table:

**Table 2.** *Population of the Study*

Class	Total Number Of Students
PBI 4A	25
PBI 4B	21
PBI 4C	22
PBI 4D	28
Total	96

The writer drew 3 classes out of four classes from the population of the study based on two reasons; similar number of students and similar range of writing anxiety. From the results of second language writing anxiety inventory questionnaire given to all students of Writing IV classes prior the treatment, the writer chose PBI 4A, PBI 4B, and PBI 4C as the group samples of the study, since all the students in these three classes had similar total number of students, and shows similar number of students who have low and high writing anxiety as the samples.

### Instruments

#### Writing Test

In order to assess students writing ability, the writer used essay writing test. In the test, the students were assigned to choose one out of four provided expository essay topics and asked to produce the essay consisted of four till five paragraphs based on the chosen topic. In order to score the writing, the writer chose two independent lecturers from other universities as the rater of students' writing. The writer asked the two raters to employ a scoring rubric developed by Hyland (2003). The rubric consists of four criteria of writing to assess as follows: (1) format and content; (2) organization and coherence and (3) sentence construction & vocabulary.

### **Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI)**

The questionnaire used to measure students' writing anxiety was adopted from the one developed by Cheng (2004) named *Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory* (SLWAI). The SLWAI consists of 22 items. The theoretical ranges of the scale are from 22 to 110. Lower scores indicate lower writing anxiety (lower than 66) and higher scores indicate higher writing anxiety (higher than 66).

### **Procedures**

In the first week, the students were given an expository essay writing test in order to gain the data of students' writing ability and were asked to fulfill SLWAI (Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory) adapted from the SLWAI developed by Cheng (2004). The SLWAI was given to the students prior the treatments in order to gain the data of the level of students' writing anxiety. Based on the results of writing test scores and SLWAI questionnaire, the writer choose PBI 4A, PBI 4B, and PBI 4C as the experimental groups.

During the 2nd till 16th week, the writer gave treatments to the three experimental groups of students. The first experimental group was taught by using teacher feedback writing technique. The second experimental group was taught by using peer feedback writing technique. Finally, the third group was taught by using the combination between peer and teacher writing feedback technique.

In "teacher feedback" class, the students were introduced on how to write an essay that focused on three expository essay skills; "classification" essay, "cause and effect" essay and "compare and contrast" essay. Each skill of the expository essay was taught in 5 meetings that comprised of the following steps; brainstorming, writing a first draft, having teacher feedback session I (teacher written feedback), doing the first revision, having teacher feedback session II (oral conference), and doing second revision as the final draft.

Then, in "peer feedback" class, the the students were introduced on how to write an essay that focused on the same three expository essay skills as in "teacher feedback" class; that comprised of the following steps; brainstorming, writing a first draft , having peer feedback session I (the students shared their feedbacks to their friends' essay in the form of written and verbal feedback), doing the first revision, having peer feedback session II (the students shared their feedbacks to their friends' essay in the form of written and verbal feedback), and doing second revision as the final draft.

In "the combination of peer and teacher feedback", similar to "teacher feedback" and "peer feedback", the students were taught in the following steps; brainstorming, writing a first draft, having a pre-training session (the students were modelled on how to give feedback to their friends' essay), having peer feedback session I (the students shared their feedbacks to their friends' essay in the form of written and verbal feedback), having "teacher intervention session" (the lecturer reviewed what the students had already done, described the common mistakes that the students had done, and reminded them on not doing the same mistakes again), having peer

feedback session II (the students shared their feedbacks to their friends essay in the form of written and verbal feedback), and doing second revision as the final draft

Finally, at the end of the sessions, the students were asked to do essay writing composition test as the posttest to gain students' writing ability after they were taught by using each writing feedback technique. The students were asked to produce one expository essay consisted of four till five paragraphs.

### Data Analysis

The data gained from students' essay writing scores of the pretest and the posttest were analyzed based using SPSS analysis. For the first till the third research questions (Q1 till Q3), the quantitative data gained from students' essay writing scores of the pretest and the posttest were analyzed by using paired *t*-test analysis. Meanwhile, in order to answer the fourth and the fifth (Q4 and Q5) research questions, the data of students' posttest scores were analyzed by using two-Way ANOVA and Tukey Post Hoc Test.

### Results

In this section, the results gained from the statistical analysis are illustrated based on each proposed research question.

Q1. What is the effect of teacher feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?

In order to find out whether or not there was an effect of the implementation of teacher feedback writing technique on student's writing ability of students with different writing anxiety, the writers used paired *t*-test analysis.

#### Low Writing Anxiety

The results of paired *t*-test analysis of students having low writing anxiety are displayed in Table 3 below:

**Table 3.** Paired Samples *T*-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having Low Writing Anxiety, Taught by Using Teacher Feedback Writing Technique

	Paired Differences						<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean	Error95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		Lower				Upper
				Lower	Upper					
Pair 1	TFlowPre TFLowPost	-- 3.72222	1.43856	.47952	-4.82799	-2.61645	-7.762	8	.000	

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0,000) was lower than  $\alpha$  (0.025). Meanwhile,  $t_{obtained}$  (-7.762) was lower than  $-t_{(0,025,8)}$  3.833. In other words,  $H_{01}$  was rejected and  $H_{a1}$  was accepted or there was significant effect of teacher feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with low writing anxiety

#### High Writing Anxiety

The results of paired *t*-test analysis of students having high writing anxiety are displayed in Table 4 below:

**Table 4.** Paired Samples *T*-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having High Writing Anxiety, Taught by Using Teacher Feedback Writing Technique

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean	Error95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	TFhighPre TFhighPost	-- 1.00000	1.97714	.57075	-2.25622	.25622	-1.752	11.108	

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0.108) was higher than  $\alpha$  (0.025). Meanwhile,  $t_{obtained}$  (-1.752) was higher than  $-t_{(0.025,11)}$  3,497. In other words,  $H_{02}$  was accepted and  $H_{a2}$  was rejected or there was no significant effect of teacher feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with high writing anxiety.

Q2. What is the effect of peer feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?

In order to find out whether or not there was an effect of the implementation of peer feedback writing technique on student's writing ability of students with different writing anxiety, the writers used paired t-test analysis.

### Low Writing Anxiety

The results of paired t-test analysis of students having low writing anxiety are displayed in Table 5 below:

**Table 5.** Paired Samples T-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having Low Writing Anxiety who were Taught by Using Peer Feedback Writing Technique

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean	Error95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PFlowPre PFlowPost	-- 5.40909	1.13618	.34257	-6.17239	-4.64579	-15.790	10,000	

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0.000) was lower than  $\alpha$  (0.025). Meanwhile,  $t_{obtained}$  (-15.790) was lower than  $-t_{(0.025,8)}$  3,581. In other words,  $H_{03}$  was rejected and  $H_{a3}$  was accepted or there was significant effect of peer feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with low writing anxiety.

### High Writing Anxiety

The results of paired t-test analysis of students having high writing anxiety are displayed in Table 6 below:

**Table 6 .** Paired Samples T-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having High Writing Anxiety who were Taught by Using Peer Feedback Writing Technique

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean	Error95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PFhighPre PFhighPost	-- .85714	1.59842	.42720	-1.78004	.06576	-2,006	13,066	

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0,066) was higher than  $\alpha$  (0,025). Meanwhile,  $t_{\text{obtained}}$  (-2,006) was higher than  $-t_{(0,025,13)}$  3,372. In other words,  $H_{04}$  was accepted and  $H_{a4}$  was rejected or there was no significant effect of peer feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with high writing anxiety.

Q3. What is the effect of the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique on the writing ability of the students with different writing anxiety?

In order to find out whether or not there was an effect of the implementation of the combination of peer & teacher feedback writing technique on writing ability of students with different writing anxiety, the writers used paired t-test analysis.

### Low Writing Anxiety

The results of paired t-test analysis of students having low writing anxiety are displayed in Table 7 below:

**Table 7. Paired Samples T-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having Low Writing Anxiety, Taught by Using 'the Combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback'**

#### Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 PTFlowPre PTFlow	-11,55000	1,80201	,56984	-12,83908	-10,26092	-20,269	9	,000

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0,000) was lower than  $\alpha$  (0,025). Meanwhile,  $t_{\text{obtained}}$  (-20,269) was lower than  $-t_{(0,025,9)}$  3,690. In other words,  $H_{05}$  was rejected and  $H_{a5}$  was accepted or there was significant effect of the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with low writing anxiety.

### High Writing Anxiety

The results of paired t-test analysis of students having high writing anxiety are displayed in Table 8 below:

**Table 8. Paired Samples T-Test of Students' Essay Writing Scores Having High Writing Anxiety, Taught by Using 'the Combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback'**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 PTFlowPre PTFlow	11,54167	3,52561	1,01776	-13,78173	-9,30160	-11,340	11	,000

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that sig (two tailed) (0,000) was lower than  $\alpha$  (0,025). Meanwhile,  $t_{\text{obtained}}$  (-11,340) was lower than  $-t_{(0,025,11)}$  3,497. In other words,  $H_{06}$  was rejected and  $H_{a6}$  was accepted or there was significant effect of the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique to the writing ability of students with high writing anxiety.

Q.4. Is there any interaction among writing feedback techniques, students' writing anxiety and students' writing ability?

The test of hypotheses was conducted by using Two-way ANOVA with the same cell. The summary of two-way ANOVA is displayed in Table 9 below:

**Table 9. The Summary of 3x2 , two-way ANOVA**

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2728.149 <sup>a</sup>	5	545.630	18.901	.000	.604
Intercept	311910.638	1	311910.638	10804.794	.000	.994
feedback	995.154	2	497.577	17.236	.000	.357
anxiety	1524.838	1	1524.838	52.821	.000	.460
feedback * anxiety	289.986	2	144.993	5.023	.010	.139
Error	1789.804		6228.868			
Total	317252.250		68			
Corrected Total	4517.952		67			

a. R Squared = ,604 (Adjusted R Squared = ,572)

Because the value of  $F_0$  among students' writing anxiety scores (52.821) was higher than the value of  $F_{table}$  (0.05) (3.15) and  $F_{table}$  (0,01) (4,98), thus  $H_{07}$  was rejected and the difference among students' writing anxiety scores was significant. Then, because the value of  $F_0$  of interaction between writing feedback techniques and students' writing anxiety (5.083) was higher than the value of  $F_{table}$  (0.05) (2.52) and  $F_{table}$  (0.01) (3.65), thus  $H_{08}$  was rejected. It means that there was an interaction between writing feedback techniques and students' writing anxiety toward students' writing ability.

*Q.5. How are the comparisons among the effects of the combination of peer and teacher feedback, teacher feedback and peer feedback writing techniques on students' writing ability with different writing anxiety?*

In order to find out the significant effects or mean test posttest scores of low and high writing anxiety students of each group treatment, the analysis of Tukey's Post Hoc test was conducted.

### Low writing anxiety

The results of Tukey Test analysis could be seen in Table 10 below:

**Table 10. The Summary of Tukey's Post Hoc Test for Low Writing Anxiety Students**

(I) Feedback	(J) Feedback	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. 95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
TFLow	PFLow	2.73232	2.50836	.529	-3.4869 8.9516
	PTFLow	-9.97222	2.56418	.002	-16.3299 -3.6146
PFLow	TFLow	-2.73232	2.50836	.529	-8.9516 3.4869
	PTFLow	-12.70455	2.43840	.000	-18.7504 -6.6587
PTFLow	TFLow	9.97222	2.56418	.002	3.6146 16.3299
	PFLow	12.70455	2.43840	.000	6.6587 18.7504

Based on Tukey Test analysis, it was found that; 1) the writing ability of group of students having low writing anxiety who were taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique was better than those who were taught by using teacher feedback writing technique; 2) the writing ability of group of students having low writing anxiety who were taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique was better than those who were taught by using peer feedback writing technique and 3) There was no

significant difference between the ability of students having low writing anxiety who were taught by using teacher feedback and peer feedback writing technique.

### High writing anxiety

The results of the analysis of Tukey's Post Hoc test could be seen in Table 11 below:

**Table 11.** *The Summary of Tukey's Post Hoc Test for High Writing Anxiety Students*

	(I) Feedback(J) Feedback	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. 95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
TFHigh	PFHigh	-4.16667	2.04836	.119	-9.1796
	PTFHigh	-7.20833	2.12569	.005	-12.4105
PFHigh	TFHigh	4.16667	2.04836	.119	-.8462
	PTFHigh	-3.04167	2.04836	.310	-8.0546
PTFHigh	TFHigh	7.20833	2.12569	.005	2.0062
	PFHigh	3.04167	2.04836	.310	-1.9712

Based on the results of Tukey Test analysis it was found that 1) the writing ability of group of students having high writing anxiety who were taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback was better than those by using teacher feedback writing technique; 2) there was no significant difference between students' writing ability of students who were taught by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback and those who were taught by using peer feedback writing technique and 3) There was no significant difference between the ability of students having high writing anxiety who were taught by using teacher feedback and peer feedback writing technique

### Discussion

In this section, the writers discussed the results of the data analysis to answer each of the proposed research questions.

Based on the results of the analysis of paired t-test (see Table 1) from the data gained from writing scores of pretest and posttest of students having low and high writing anxiety, it could be inferred that teacher feedback was effective for students having low writing anxiety but it was not effective to implement in teaching writing to high anxiety students that tended to have poor writing ability.

The ineffectiveness of teacher feedback was probably due to some weaknesses of the learning processes proposed by some researchers. First, since the teaching and learning process was really teacher-centered, It made the students bored much and it made their concentration frequently lost. (Hansen & Stephens, 2000; Vedanayagam, 1994). Another weakness that the writer found during the learning activities was the limited written feedbacks given by the lecturer. The lack of teacher's written feedback has already been reported by Ferris (1997). The limited feedbacks given by the teacher was probably caused by varied level of writing ability of the students in the class (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990).

Moreover, the writers found out that the students (mostly for high writing anxiety students) tended to be passive recipients especially in oral conference session. The students just accepted all of the feedbacks without any confirmations. This happened because of teacher/lecturer's dependency. The writers identified that most of high writing anxiety student that commonly had poor writing ability showed that they really depended on their lecturer. They just accepted their lecturer's feedbacks without any confirmation. They were really nervous when they were asked to have oral conference to their lecturer. The worst thing was that the high

writing anxiety students never asked any questions, and frequently felt confused on what to revise with their essay. In contrast, it seemed that low writing anxiety students could follow all steps of the activities. They felt enthusiastic. However, they still felt reluctant to have face to face discussion with their lecturer that made them as the passive learners sometimes.

Becoming passive learners has already been reported too by Hansen & Stephens (2000). They described that teacher centered learning would make the students to become passive recipients of information that has been delivered by the lecturer. Thus, the students become dependent on their lecturer to tell them what they need to know and can avoid taking responsibility for their own learning

Based on the results of the paired t-test analysis of the data gained from writing scores of pretest and posttest of students having low and high writing anxiety, it could be inferred that peer feedback was effective for students having low writing anxiety but not for high writing anxiety students.

The writers discovered that active involvement in the learning process actually had positive impact to students. The students either having low or high writing anxiety seemed enjoyable. Students' enjoyment in learning has been proposed by other researchers who believed that the use of peer feedback in L1 settings as well as in ESL/EFL writing classrooms should be practiced for releasing anxiety in writing (Mendonça and Johnson, 1994; Villamil and de Guerrero, 1996).

However, students' lack of English ability could be barriers in producing effective feedbacks. The writers found out that the barriers happened to students having high writing anxiety that tended to have low writing ability. Students having high writing anxiety looked confused on what to do when they were required to share feedbacks to their peers in group. They also looked nervous. Students' lack of English ability as the barrier in the implementation of peer feedback writing technique has also been reported by other researchers. Some researchers (Nelson & Murphy 1993; Lockhart & Ng 1993; Mendoca & Johnson 1994; F. Hyland 2000) have found that students have problems detecting errors and providing quality feedback, sometimes resorting to formulaic comments on each others' writing, or they may give inappropriate and over-critical feedback or over-focus on surface errors.

Thus, Peer feedback which emphasizes collaborative learning and student-centered learning cannot be done independently without any intervention from the teacher or the lecturer. However, if there was such good drilling system on how to give effective feedback, the clear guideline, and the lecturer's reflection that reviews and reminds the common mistakes done by the students, then the implementation of peer feedback is still promising.

Based on the results of the paired t-test analysis, it could be inferred that the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique was effective either for students having low or high writing anxiety. The writers discovered that the implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback ran well and effective because of the lecturer's intervention during peer feedback session. This kind of intervention made the students either having low or high writing anxiety feel secure and sure on what they do during the activities. By having such gently reminder from the lecturer during the lecturer's review in the middle of learning activities, the students were always reminded on doing the effective peer feedback sessions and became aware for not doing the same mistakes again. The importance of teacher/ lecturer's intervention in learning activities has already been proposed too by Rollinson (2005) that there should be adequate training given to students that is, coaching students in the principles and practices of effective peer group interaction and response. Without such training, it is more likely that

students' response will be inappropriate: it may be destructive and tactless (or, conversely, overgenerous and uncritical).

Based on the results of Two-Way ANOVA analysis it could be inferred that there was an interaction between writing feedback techniques and students' writing anxiety toward students' writing ability. In other words, the effect of writing feedback techniques on students' writing achievement depends on the degree of students' writing anxiety.

There were actually some studies that investigated the influence of student's writing anxiety toward their writing ability. The studies showed similar findings that students with low writing anxiety had better writing performance than those with high writing anxiety (Cheng, 2002; Hassan, 2001).

Based on the results of Tukey Post Hoc test, it could be inferred that the implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback was more effective than teacher feedback either for students having low or high writing anxiety. Moreover, "the combination of peer and teacher feedback" seemed more effective than peer feedback for students with low writing anxiety. Finally, even though there was no significant difference between "the combination of peer and teacher feedback" and "peer feedback" for high writing anxiety students, the mean scores improvement of "the combination of peer and teacher feedback" was higher than "peer feedback". Thus, it can be inferred that "the combination of peer and teacher feedback" was also more effective than "peer feedback" for students having high writing anxiety.

The writers discovered that in "the combination of peer and teacher feedback" class, by having sharing feedback with peers and group, the students were automatically engaged in the activities. They did not just focus on their lecturer that made them easy to get bored. Moreover, by sharing feedbacks with others would limit the revision only based on the lecturer's feedback. Then, the students would not just accept the feedbacks from their peers but they could have personal control to consider whether they would use the feedbacks or not to revise their essay. As the results, it would make the students not to become dependent to their lecturer.

However, the students could not be left to work without any interference from the lecturer. It was because they used to work with their full lecturer's control. To let the students work fully independent would make them depressed. Thus, the lecturer's intervention would be needed in order to refresh about what have already happened, remind the common mistakes and increase students' awareness for not doing the same mistakes.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the data the writers got from the research, it can be concluded that first, teacher feedback was effective for students having low writing anxiety but not for those having high writing anxiety. Second, peer feedback was effective for students having low writing anxiety but not for those having high writing anxiety. Third, the combination of peer and teacher feedback was effective either for students having low or high writing anxiety. Fourth, there was interaction among writing feedback techniques, students' writing anxiety and students' writing ability. Finally, the combination of peer and teacher feedback was more effective than teacher feedback and peer feedback either for students having low or high writing anxiety.

### **References & related sources**

Andianto. (2016). The effectiveness of teacher feedback technique toward students' writing ability. *Pedagogy Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 10-18.

Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 313-335.

Cheng, Y.-S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 647-656.

Cheng, Y.S, Horwitz, E.K., & Schallert, D.L., (1999). Language writing anxiety; Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*, 417-446

Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions, In A. Wendon & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall

Cohen, A.D., & Cavalcanti, M.C. (1990). Feedback on composition: Teacher-student verbal reports, In B. Kroll, *Second language writing research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw Hill.

Ferris, D.R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision: *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 315-339

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R.B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited

Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 443-460.

Hansen, E.J., & Stephens, J.A. (2000). The ethics of learner-centered education: Dynamics that impede the process. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 32*(5), 40-47.

Hassan, B. (2001). The relationship of writing apprehension and self-Esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL university students. *Mansoura Faculty of Education Journal, 39*, 1-36.

Hyland, K., & Fiona Hyland. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. 39, 77-95. doi:10.1017/S0261444806003399

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 33-54.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Michigan: the University of Michigan Press.

Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1993). How useful is peer response?. *Perspectives, 5*(1), 17-29.

Mendoca, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745-768.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D.M. Johnson, & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students*, 207-219. New York, NY: Longman.

Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments

in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 135–142.

Paulus, T.M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.

Patthey-Chavez, G., & Ferris, D (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31(1), 51-90.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30.

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts*, 12(1), 7-17

Tsui, A.B.M., & Maria NG. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170

Vedanayagam, E.G. (1994). *Teaching technology for college teacher*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers. Ltd.

Villamil, O.S., & Guerrero, M.C.M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 51-75.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Learning*, 15(3), 179-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004>

Yarrow, F. and Topping K. J. (2001). Collaborative learning: The effects of metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 261–282.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.